

### REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending in the application. Claims 1-15 are rejected.

#### Claim Amendments

The claims have been amended to clarify the claimed invention. For example the independent claims have "the second service profile" clarified in that "... a second service profile having a format which includes control information applied to a packet that the mobile node communicates using a communication path established after completing of the location registration and the format remains the same irrespective to the kind of a service provided to a user; ....."

These amendments based on the description in applicant's specification page 35, line 7 to page 37, line 20 for example. No new matter is entered.

The "second service profile" is associated with the phrase, "the service profile generated by service managing unit 102 of the AAAH 100" (described on page 35, starting from line 7).

It is also important to the claimed invention that, for example in claim 1, a server system includes a distributing unit distributing the second service profile to the home agent and the foreign agent."

As pointed out above Applicant's claimed invention includes the features of the service managing unit for editing the first service profile into the second service profile, wherein the second service profile includes control information that is applied to packets exchanged between mobile nodes using paths that are completed as soon as the location registrations are completed.

Here, the second service profile is to be distributed to home agents and foreign agents and the format of the second service profile remains the same irrespective to the kind of a service offered to a user.

### Claims Rejections

Claims 1-5 and 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Leung et al. (U.S. 6,795,857) (hereinafter Leung).

There are at least three reasons pointed out below why Leung is different from the claimed invention.

1)

In the Office Action it appears that the IP address conversion to MAC address is being equated with applicant's claimed second service profile. The Office Action points to col. 6, 1-23 and col. 13, 53 to col. 14, line 41. If this is not the case clarification is respectfully requested.

Leung clearly describes the MAC address is associated with the FA. The FA may send a gratuitous ARP to have the nodes on the link update the ARP cache. Leung also describes that the FAs have the virtual agent IP address.

In the claimed invention, for example claim 1, the server system includes a distributing unit distributing the second service profile to the home agent and the foreign agent.

The Office Action points to col. 2 to show the distributing the second profile, however the Office Action is equating the second profile to the MAC address and col. 2 does not describe the MAC address being distributed, this is described as pointed out above where the FA sends an ARP.

Accordingly elements of applicant's claimed invention cannot be redefined to fit portions of the Leung reference. The second service profile must be defined as in col. 2, lines 31-56 or in col. 13, line 53 to col. 14, line 41. If the second service profile is being considered equivalent to Leung's MAC address sent by ARP, it is respectfully submitted this is different because the FA is sending the ARP.

Applicant claims the server distributing the second profile in contrast Leung teach the FA sending its MAC address. Leung is different from the claimed features

2)

Again the Office Action points to the MAC address of a second agent is used for subsequent communication when the node registers with the second agent. It is believed that the conversion from the virtual agent IP address to each MAC address of a FA is be equated.

However applicant claims: extracting a first service profile corresponding to the mobile node from a database for managing the first service profile which includes subscriber information of each user.

Leung fails to make any reference to a virtual agent IP address being extracted from a database for managing the first service profile which includes subscriber information of each user. In fact the virtual IP address is not extracted from a database for managing first service profiles.

The reference describes that the FAs have dummy interface IP addresses. There is not a description of applicant's claimed features of extracting from a database with regard to Leung's IP address or MAC address and then sending the extracted, edited profile. Again elements of applicant's claimed invention cannot be redefined to fit portions of the Leung reference.

3)

According to RFC 2002 (Request for comments) of the IETF (Internet Engineering Task Force), Mobile IP normally registers an FA as a default gateway while an MN receives an advertisement message from the FA.

Leung is concerned with an invention for accomplishing Mobile IP for a MN that does not employ Mobile IP. Again the Office Action col. 6, lines 1-23 and col. 13, line 53 to col. 14, line 41 are pointed to.

However Leung discloses a method for causing an FA address to be converted into a stationary address (MAC) rather than causing the MN to receive an advertising message, and for using the ARP (Address Resolution Protocol) to specify correspondence between IP addresses and MAC addresses of FAs.

It is respectfully submitted that Leung's means for converting an IP address into a MAC address as pointed to in the Office Action is distinguishable from applicant's claimed invention, for example, the unit for editing the first service profile into the second service profile and the second service profile is to be distributed to home agents and foreign agents and the format of the second service profile remains the same irrespective to the kind of a service offered to a user.

Leung does not describe extracting and editing. If the updating of the ARP cache is being equated with editing then there is no description of sending the updated ARP cache. The associations being made in the Office Action are not consistent and are being changed to fit different portions of the Leung reference.

Applicant's claimed invention is characterized by the service managing unit for editing the first service profile into the second service profile, wherein the second service profile includes control information that is applied to packets exchanged between mobile nodes using paths that are completed as soon as the location registrations are completed.

Leung is teaching registration by an other method than Mobile IP without relying on the MN. The FA and HA do exchange Mobile IP messages between them, however these are standard Mobile IP messages with no description of applicant's claimed extracting, editing and


distributing and the format of the second service profile remains the same irrespective to the kind of a service offered to a user.

As reviewed above, the means for converting an IP address into a MAC address pointed to by the examiner and disclosed in Leung is distinguishable from the claimed invention, namely, the unit for editing the first service profile into the second service profile.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brian S. Myers  
Reg. No. 46,947

CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304  
Telephone: (212) 940-8703  
Fax: (212) 940-8986 or 8987  
Docket No.: FUJO 18.314 (100794-11658)  
BSM:fd